

JAAN PUHVEL

Homer and Hittite

*For Professor Toporov,
with many thanks for the
Old Balts, and herding
freedom for the New Balticum,*

J.P.

Die „Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft“ werden gefördert von der
Kulturabteilung des Amtes der Tiroler Landesregierung

CIP-Titelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek:

Puhvel, Jaan

Homer and Hittite / Jaan Puhvel. —

Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwiss. d. Univ., 1991

(Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft:

Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften; 47)

ISBN 3-85 124-614-4

NE: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft /
Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften

1991

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Herausgeber: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Meid

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck

A-6020 Innsbruck, Innrain 52

Herstellung: Druckerei G. Grasl, A-2540 Bad Vöslau

Bestell- und Auslieferungsadresse:

IBS-Vertrieb, A-6020 Innsbruck, Elisabethstraße 11

CONTENTS

Preface	7
Part 1: Embedded Anatolianisms in Greek Epic	9
Part 2: The East Ionic and Hittite Iteratives	13
Part 3: Homeric and Hittite Similes Compared	21

Preface

The topic seems timely, and not only because of the recrudescence of the "Ahhiyawa-question", as publicized particularly by Machteld J. Mellink's edited volume *Troy and the Trojan War* (1986). Such long known close accordances as those between the cremation protocols of Patroklos and Hektor in the *Iliad* (books 23 and 24) and the mortuary rites of Hittite royalty are supplemented by the parallels between the funeral games that follow in the same book and what we know of Hittite sport (cf. Wendy J. Raschke [ed.], *The Archaeology of the Olympics* 26–31 [1988]). As I have also tried to show elsewhere (e.g. *AJP* 104: 217–27 [1983], 109: 591–3 [1988]), detailed problems of Homeric philology can frequently be seen in a new light and elucidated in unexpected ways when properly juxtaposed to relevant data from the Anatolian archives.

In this further instalment, three examples drawn from the cultural orbit and straddling the mundane and the sacral spheres (swearing, weighing, and dressing) first serve to "dramatize" the potential of this approach. They are followed by two attempts, one linguistic and the other more literary, to illumine the possibility of a direct Anatolian impact on Homeric language and style. Because the evidence is ongoing and cumulative, a measure of tentativeness and forbearance may befit the presentation and reception of these *obiter scripta*.

Part 1

Embedded Anatolianisms in Greek Epic

In the third book of the *Iliad* the warring sides arrange an abortive showdown joust between Aleksandros-Paris and Menelaos, in order to settle title to Helen and thus put an end to the ten-year siege of Troy. Joint oath ceremonies take place which bind the parties to abide honorably by the outcome. Agamemnon presides and prefaces his ritual sheep-sacrifice with an invocation of divine witnesses as follows (276 – 280):

Zeῦ πάτερ, Ἴδηθεν μεδέων, κύδιστε, μέγιστε,
Ἡελίος θ', ὅς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις,
καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ γαῖα, καὶ οἱ ὑπένερθε καμόντας
ἀνθρώπους τίνυσθον, ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ὁμόσση,
ὕμεῖς μάρτυροι ἔστε, φυλάσσετε δ' ὅρκια πιστά.

'Father Zeus, who rule from Ida, most famed and great,
and Sun, who see all and hear all,
and rivers, and earth, and you who in the netherworld
punish dead men who have forsworn themselves,
you be witnesses and guard faithful oaths!'

This tandem invocation of Idaean (rather than Olympian) Zeus and of Helios παντοπτης is a piece of Asianic theology often replicated in Hittite texts where the storm-god and sun-god are jointly addressed. This is accordingly not a Greek oath but a Trojan one, Anatolian in kind. The whole is evocative of the closing formulas of Hittite state treaties where the oath-taker swears by (and thereby in a way co-opts for trust-keeping) the witnessing gods of the other party. Hittite polytheism with its absorptional and syncretistic capabilities tended to expand such lists to impressive proportions, but they have rather fixed parameters, regularly starting with the chief solar and storm divinities and ending with mountains, rivers, springs, clouds, heaven, earth, and sea. The Homeric oath with its invocation of storm-god, sun-god, rivers, and earth appears to be an abbreviated poetic variant of the same type of litany, indicative of

precise cultural ties stretching from aeolic milieus of East Ionia, via the Asianic Trojans with their *interpretatio Graeca* and their (Luwo-)Lycian allies, to the heartland of Anatolian culture as embodied in the Hittite texts. A linguistic linkage of the sun-gods' names is not to be ruled out: although the Hittite ^DUTU-*us* normally reflects the Hattic-based autochthonous *Istanus* (as in the heliopolitan name of the cult-city of *Istanuwa* or [Luwian] *Astanuwa*), the sun-god of Lystra in classical Lycaonia (south of Iconium, the modern Konya in Turkey) was known as ^DUTU-*liya* ^{URU}*Lusna* (*KUB XVII 19,9*); like the theophorous man's name ^DUTU-*liya* (*KUB LV 54 passim*), it may be read as **Sāweliya*, a Hittite cognate of the Homeric Ἥλιος, or perhaps rather **Hāweliya*, an Ahhiyawan-Mycenaean form of the sun-god's name. Quite possibly, then, the interaction was a two-way street: a Helladic name of the solar deity had been absorbed into local cult in Western Anatolia, and such cult in turn supplied the "Trojan oath" for the Greeks to swear on Asianic soil.

The Iliadic Zeus not only serves as an oath-god but also acts as the supposedly even-handed ταμίης πολέμοιο 'dispenser of war' (*Iliad* 19.224), while the divine underlings around him strive to accord unfair military advantage in blatantly partisan fashion. One of his functions as the divine justicer and allocator is the symbolic weighing of binary doom-lots (δύο χῆρε [*Iliad* 8.70]) which he tilts (κλίνεισσι [*Iliad* 19.223]), stretches (ἐτίταινε), and lifts (ἔλκε), so that the losing side's doom sinks (ῥέπτε) and settles to the earth (ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ), while the fortunes of the victor are lifted to high heaven (πρὸς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἄερθεν [*Iliad* 8.69–74]). Hektor is alarmed because he knows the function of those scales (γυνῶ γὰρ Διὸς ἱρὰ τάλαντα [*Iliad* 16.658]), and in due time his own fate comes up for weighing and takes a plunge to Hades (*Iliad* 22.209–13).

This extended metaphor of the scales of fate looks like a poetic conceit based on homespun material, such as the only reference to mundane weighing in Homer, in the simile of a poor but scrupulous spinster who holds weights and wool-ration and balances scales (τάλαντα) evenly on both sides (ἀμφὶς ἀνέλκει ἰσάζουσα [*Iliad* 12.433–5]). But clearly the emphasis is on doom, so that the sinking to the earth of the loser's lot is the significant element, while the more trivial part of the victor's elevation is little more than a stylistic pendant; when Hektor's doom sinks, nothing at all is said about Achilles' good fortune.

A better parallel, in fact a ritual and legalistic model, is found in Hittite texts pointing to an actual Anatolian tradition of symbolically weighing the lives of royalty, as in *KBo XXI 22 Vs. 18–19*: *kāsa* GIŠ.RÍN

karpıyemi nu Labarnas taluqaus MU.HI.A-us usneskimi 'to I pick up scales and place in the balance the long years of the Ruler'. Formal weighing took place preferentially in sight of the all-seeing sun-god, the guarantor of justice, as seen both in actual ritual scenes involving metals like lead (*KBo XVII 95 III 6–10*) or silver, gold and gemstones (*KBo XV 10 II 41–42*), and in prayerful references to the corruption of this world (*KUB XXX 10 Rs. 12–13 LÜDAM.GAR-sa [...]* ^DUTU-i ^{GIS}ēlzi harzi nu ^{GIS}ēlzi marsanuzzi 'the merchant holds the scales before the sun-god and [yet] falsifies the scales'). A moral inheres also the in the royal mortuary texts (*KUB XXX 15 + XXXIX 19 Vs. 26–28*) where a sorceress weighs silver, gold, and gemstones against mortar, symbolically pitting human clay against worldly wealth, and later the scales themselves are broken in a further affirmation of mortality. But most interesting is paragraph 69 of the Hittite Law Code (*KBo VI 13 I 6–8*) where the wronged party in a boundary dispute is instructed to appeal to the sun-god with the statement ^{GIS}ēlzi-mit-wa taknā arsikkīt 'he has planted my scale-tray in the earth'. This legalese seems idiomatic for miscarriage of justice, of getting an unfair deal, of seeing the scales tipped in one's disfavor, much as in the Homeric ἐπὶ χθονὶ ἐξέσθην 'settled to the earth' or ὤχετο δ' εἰς Αἴδαο 'ended up in Hades'. The Homeric and Hittite usages reflect common idiom referring figuratively to a twin-scale, center-mounted weighing contraption such as the Greek τέλαντα and the Latin *bilanx libra*. Such idiom occurs in actual ritual and legal use in Hittite but survives only embedded in literary imagery in the Asianic Homeric tradition.

Another topos of Greek epic tradition is the decking (or occasional undressing) of goddesses to seductive ends, as with the adornment of Pandora (Hesiod, *Theogony* 573–87, *Erga* 72–6) or in Ankhises' ἔκδυσις of Aphrodite (*Hymn to Aphrodite* 162–6). The most detailed is Hera's toilet in *Iliad* 14.170–86, where in preparation for cohabiting with Zeus she cleanses herself with ambrosia, uses ointments, combs her hair, plaits braids, puts on an ambrosial gown, earrings, mantilla, and sandals, in short, an entire κόσμος (187). Clearly such scenes are drawn from (or elaborated upon) actual dress of the late Helladic-Asianic period, which is "animated" for us in descriptions of the ceremonial arraying of a Hittite queen (315/t 1 10–11): *nu-za SÍG ZA.GÌN-az HÜPPI GUŠKIN [...]* ^{TUG}hū-pigann-a dāi 'along with blue wool she puts on gold earring(s) ... and a mantilla', matching closely *Iliad* 14.182–4: ἐν δ' ἄρα ἔρματα ἤκεν ἐϋτρή-τοις λοβοῖσι ... κρηδέμενῳ δ' ἐφύπερθε καλύψατο 'she hung earrings from her well-pierced lobes ... and covered herself at the top with a mantilla'.

This mantilla hung from the $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ or head-dress, as indicated by another passage where a furious Hittite goddess in distraction puts her clothes on backwards: TÚG.DINGIR-LIM-wa-as-za-kan TUDITTI.HI.A EGIR-[pa paskil] nu-ssi TÚG^hhūpiki āpizzi [piran huinut] hantezzi-ma-za appizziaz [huinut 'she pinned breastplates to the back of her divine raiment, she trailed the back of her mantilla in front, but the front she trailed in back' (KUB XXXIII 67 I 29–31, emended from KUB XXXIII 36 II 1–3). Thus in the Hittite texts the transition from earthly dress to divine decking is still a normal one, while in the Greek epic tradition once again, as with the "Trojan oath" and with the fate-scales of Zeus, the topos has frozen in mythical-literary time and lost its touch with mundane reality.

Part 2

The East Ionic and Hittite Iteratives

The augmentless preterital East Ionic *-σχε-* conjugation (formed on either the present or the aorist stem) escalates imperfective aspectual marking. It is neither durative nor iterative but indicates on-going and open-ended action. Whether this action be continuous or repetitive depends on the semantics of the verb, as in English 'kept smiling' vs. 'kept jumping'. Whether the nuance is one of duration or habit can also depend on the context, e.g. 'kept smiling until the face muscles got tired' vs. 'kept smiling in various situations', in the latter case equivalent to 'would smile, used to smile'. Thus ἐνθα δὲ Σίσυφος ἔσχε (*Iliad* 6.153) meant simply 'there dwelt Sisyphos', just like the repeatedly attested ναε-τάσχε; it signified more precisely 'had his residence', even as Achilles ἔζεσχε in his encampment (*Iliad* 24.472) without necessarily always squatting there (Priam luckily 'found him home' when he came calling), or a food server ἐφίζεσχε 'had his seat' at the carving counter (*Odyssey* 17.331) whenever he was on the job. Ancestral Neleus once had his chairman's seat (ἔζεσχεν) on polished stones (*Odyssey* 3.408), but more recently Nestor sat there (ibid. 411 ἐφίζε) and actually took his seat in the passage in question (ibid. 406 κατ' ἄρ' ἔξετο). Odysseus informs Achilles' ghost in Hades that Nestor and he alone regularly bested young Neoptolemos in rhetorical performance (*Odyssey* 11.512 νικάσχομεν), while Sarpedon wonders what has happened to the spunk that Hektor 'used to have' (*Iliad* 5.472 πῇ δὴ τοι μένος οἴχεται δὲ πρὶν ἔχεσχες;). Herodotus describes how 'they would put on a feast' (1.148 ἄγεσχον ὁρτήν), Hipponax has θύεσχε, and in a rare Attic literary imitation an Aristophanic character allows how he 'sold sausages and also used to do a bit of prostitution' (*Equitoes* 1242: ἡλλαντοπώλουν καὶ τι καὶ βινεσχόμεν). Occurrences in Pindar or in the tragedians can be counted on the fingers of one hand.

The remarkable feature about this formation is that it is syntactically "contagious", prone to occur in clusters or strings of its own ilk, quite the reverse of the so-called conjunction-reduction phenomenon where a grammatical marker, once posited, need not be explicitly reiterated in a

coordinate sequel, e.g. *Zeῦ πάτερ* ... *Ἡελιός τε* (vocative + nominative in *Iliad* 3.276–7) or *τὸν θεὸς Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ γούνασιν ἡυκόμεοι, καὶ οἱ ὑποσχέσθαι* ... (imperative + infinitive in *Iliad* 6.273–4). Even the spare occurrences in Herodotus (all third person singulars derived from thematic stems) appear bunched (e.g. 2.174 *κλέπτεσκε* ... *ἄγεσκον* ... *ὑποφεύγεσκον*; 4.42 *σπείρεσκον* ... *μένεσκον*; 4.78 *κατελίπεσκε* ... *λάβεσκε*). The profuse formula *ὥδε δέ τις εἶπεσκε* or *ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε* ‘so someone would say’ is occasionally resumed by *ἄλλος δ’ αὖ(τ’) εἶπεσκε* ‘another again would say’ (*Odyssey* 2.331, 21.401) or varied by *ὥς δέ τις αὖ* ... *αὐδήσασκεν* ‘would speak’, *Iliad* 17.420). It can also trigger a second occurrence in its very line, as in *Iliad* 17.423 *ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε μένος δ’ ὄρσασκεν ἐκάστου* ‘so someone would say and rouse the courage of each’, or *Iliad* 22.375 *ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε καὶ οὐτήσασκε παραστάς* ‘so someone would say and deal a wound (viz. to Hektor’s corpse) as he stood by’.

Such double occurrences, either in the same line or in successive lines, are plentiful in Homeric usage: *Odyssey* 18.325 *ἀλλ’ ἦ γ’ Εὐρυμάχῳ μισγέσκετο καὶ φιλέεσκεν* ‘she was intimate with E. and was his lover’. In the ploughing scene on the shield of Achilles (*Iliad* 18.546) a man handed (*δόσκειν*) the laborers a cup of wine while they turned (*στρέψασκον*) the furrows. Aphrodite tells Anchises how all the immortals dreaded (*τάρβεσκον*) her love-charms, for her scheming got the better of all (*πάντας* ... *δάμνασκε*; *Hymn to Aphrodite* 251). Athena boasts how she many a time saved (*σώεσκον*) Herakles when he was ground down by Eurystheus’ labors and cried out (*κλαίεσκε*) to heaven (*Iliad* 8.363–4). One moment Penelope kept looking Odysseus in the face (*ἐσίδεσκεν*), then again she could not recognize him (*ἀγνώσασκε*) wearing shabby clothes (*Odyssey* 23.94–5). Hektor would alternately rush (*ἐπαΐζασκε*) and stand still (*στάσκε*) shouting (*Iliad* 18.159–60). Automedon would easily flee (*φεύγεσκεν*), then again charge (*ἐπαΐζασκε*; *Iliad* 17.461–2). A less valiant character would dive (*δύσκεν*) for Aias for cover, who hid him (*κρύπτασκε*) with his shield (*Iliad* 8.271–2). At times the south wind would toss (*προβάλεσκε*) Odysseus’ raft to the north wind to carry, then again the east wind would leave it (*εἰζασκε*) to the west wind to pursue (*Odyssey* 5.331–2). Odysseus used to set up in a row (*ἵστασ’ ἐξείης*) twelve axes and shoot an arrow through them (*διαρρίπτασκεν οἰστόν*; *Odyssey* 19.574–5). A player would throw (*ρίπτασκε*) the ball high up, another would easily intercept it (*μεθέλεσκε*; *Odyssey* 8.374–6). A charioteer by profession (*Iliad* 6.18–9 *ἵππων ἔσκειν ὑφηνίοχος*) would befriend (*φιλέεσκεν*) all wayfarers (ibid. 15). A self-proclaimed battle-ace who could catch (*ἔλεσκεν*) any slower foe professes past distaste for other

work (ἔργον δέ μοι οὐ φίλον ἔσκειν; *Odyssey* 14. 220—2). The Cyclops pastured (ποιμαίνεισκειν; *Odyssey* 9. 188) flocks that spent the night (ἰαύεσκον; *ibid.* 184) in a cave.

The Homeric text affords equally impressive samples of strings of three or more such formations: Phoiniks' father was fond of (φιλέσκειν) a concubine and dishonored (ἀτιμάζεσκε) his wife, who always besought (λίσσέσκειτο) her son to cohabit with the wench so as to induce in her a loathing for the older fellow (*Iliad* 9. 450—1). Whenever Tantalos stooped to drink, the water disappeared (ἀπολέσκειτο) and at his feet dark soil was exposed and miraculously parched (φάνεσκε, καταζήνασκε δὲ δαίμων; *Odyssey* 11. 586—7), and the wind would toss (ρίπτασκε) overhanging fruits out of his reach (*ibid.* 592). Areithoos was generally nicknamed "the clubber" (τὸν ἐπίκλησιν κορυήτην ... κίκλησκον) because his customary fighting weapons were not bow or spear (οὐ τόξοισι μαχέσκειτο δουρί τε μακρῷ) but he crushed (ῥήγνυσκε) enemy ranks with an iron club (*Iliad* 7. 139—41). Prior to unleashing his torrential rhetoric Odysseus would stand and stare down (στάσκειν ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε) and motionless hold on to his staff (σκηπτρον ... ἄστεμφές ἔχεσκεν; *Iliad* 3. 217—9). Wiping tears, the same Odysseus in another situation would remove his cloak from his head (κεφαλῆς ἅπο φάρος ἔλεσκε), libate to the gods (σπεύσασκε θεοῖσιν; *Odyssey* 8. 88—9), and then cover his head again and cry (γοάσκειν; *ibid.* 92). Achilles had a specially made cup (οἱ δέπας ἔσκε τετυγμένον) from which no one else could drink (πίνεσκεν) wine, and from which he libated (σπένδεσκε) to Zeus alone (*Iliad* 16. 225—7). At the start of his long sulk Achilles no longer went (πωλέσκειτο) to assembly nor to war, but pined away at heart (φθινύθεσκε φίλον κῆρ) staying put, and longed for (ποθέεσκε) the clamor of battle (*Iliad* 1. 490—2). In other circumstances Achilles would wander (δινεύεσκε) distraught at night along the seashore but pay heed to daybreak (οὐδέ μιν ἤως φαινομένη λήθεσκεν; *Iliad* 24. 12—3); he would then tie (δησάσκειτο) Hektor's corpse behind his chariot and, after dragging it around Patroklos' barrow, rest (πauεύσκειτο) in his tent, leaving (ἔασκειν) the body face down in the dust (*ibid.* 15—7). Prior to getting satisfaction, Achilles recalls how he had routinely turned over (δόσκειν) all the proceeds of his raiding to the arm-chair warrior Agamemnon, who would then dole out a measly amount while keeping the bulk for himself (διὰ παῦρα δασάσκειτο πολλά δ' ἔχεσκεν; *Iliad* 9. 331—3). Aias at times was mindful of (μνησάσκειτο) bravery and held the line (ἐρητύσασκε φάλαγγας), but then again he turned to flee (τρωπάσκειτο φεύγειν; *Iliad* 11. 566—8). Hera, taking on the appearance of Stentor who could shout (αὐδήσασκε) as loud as fifty

others, tells the Greeks that as long as Achilles went to war (ἐς πόλεμον πωλέσχετο) the Trojans never ventured (οἴχνεσχον) in front of the Dardanian gates (*Iliad* 5.786–90). Sisyphos was forever pushing (ῥέεσχε) a boulder uphill which always turned back (ἀποστρέφασχε) just as it was about to go over the top (*Odyssey* 11.596–7), so that once more he had to keep pushing (ibid. 599 ἀψ ῥέεσχε). Odysseus would check (ἐρητύσασχε) a nobleman by approaching him with soft words (*Iliad* 2.189), but would strike a commoner with his stick and shout at him (σκήπτρῳ ἐλάσασχεν ὁμοκλήσασχε τε μύθῳ; ibid. 199). When Kharybdis vomited up, she seethed all over (πᾶσ' ἀναμορμύρεσχε) like a cauldron stirring on hot fire (*Odyssey* 12.238), her entire interior was exposed (φάνεσχε; ibid. 241), and at the bottom the earth came into view (φάνεσχε; ibid. 242).

There is a productive linguistic convention at work here, spawning formations with assonantal abandon that has no peer elsewhere in the ancient Greek language. The rule seems to be that just about any present or aorist stem can generate a -σχε- derivative, while otherwise in Greek -σχε- verbs are notoriously limited, having never advanced beyond an embryonic and tentative productivity. Such a stunted state can be surmised also for the proto-language from matches mirroring a verb **prk-ské-* (Skt. *prcchāti* 'ask', Lat. *poscō* 'demand', OHG *forscōn* 'inquire'), where the nuance seems to be 'ask insistently' or 'be inquisitive'. Correspondences like Gk. βᾶσχε (βᾶσχ' ἔθι frequently in Homer) : Skt. *gáccha* (Avest. *jasā*) 'go!' or Gk. ἔσχε : Lat. *escit* also attest to common antiquity. In several individual languages there is a tendency to productive secondary derivation with a specific semantic thrust, e.g. in the Latin inchoatives built mostly on stative stems in -ē- (*senēscō*, *lūcēscō*, *rubēscō*, besides relic verbs such as (*g*)*nōscō*, *discō*, *crēscō*), or in Tocharian where a causative function emerges (e.g. B *tsalpāsk-* 'help across, save' besides *tsālp-* 'pass over, attain salvation', besides *enāsk-* [A *enās-*] 'teach, instruct'), or in Hittite where a productive "iterative-durative" secondary conjugation with -*ski-* has become an overpowering linguistic presence (besides relics of the type *iski-* 'salve' (**is-ske-*) or *duski-* 'be glad' (**tus-ske-*). Greek shows intimations of an inchoative meaning in e.g. γηράσχω 'grow old' and κύσχομαι 'get pregnant' (besides γηράω and κυέω 'be pregnant'), and of a causative sense in μεθύσχω 'intoxicate' (besides μεθύω 'be drunk') or πινύσχω 'make sensible, admonish'; some verbs may have a durative tinge besides alternative present stems (e.g. χάσχω 'be agape' : χαίνω 'yawn', γανύσχομαι 'be glad' : γάνυμαι 'rejoice'). But most are simply present stems, e.g. βόσχω 'feed', λάσχω 'shriek', (ἐ)ίσχω 'make like', πάσχω 'be affected', μίσγω 'mix', ἀρέσχω 'satisfy', ἄεσχω

'dwell', ἀλύσχω 'shun', θρώσχω 'leap', βλώσχω 'go', θνήσχω 'die', εὐρίσχω 'find', ἐπαυρίσκομαι 'partake of', στερίσχω 'deprive', ἀλίσκομαι 'be caught', ὀφλισκάνω 'be liable'.

Another group has the additional present mark of reduplication and some vague stirrings of transitive-causative productivity, e.g. μινῆσχω 'remind', διδάσχω 'teach', ἰλάσκομαι 'propitiate', γινώσχω 'know', βιβρώσχω 'devour', τιτρώσχω 'wound', διδράσχω 'run away', πιπράσκομαι 'sell', πιφάσχω 'manifest', ἀπαφίσχω 'deceive', ἀραρίσχω 'fit', πιπίσχω 'give to drink', δεδίσκομαι 'frighten'.

In short, Greek at large has no productive secondary conjugation in -σχε-, only a number of relics and present stem formations with tentative semantic nuances. Contrasted with that, the East Ionic literary proliferation of a secondary preterital -σχε- category resembles nothing within Greek so much as it does the profusely formed and used Hittite iterative-durative in -ski-. Durative primacy was promoted by George Bechtel (*Hittite Verbs in -sk-* [1936]) and Edgar H. Sturtevant (*A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*² 130–2 [1951]) but has not carried the day (cf. Wolfgang Dressler, *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität* 160–2 [1968]). It is clear rather that the Hittite -ski- formation basically expresses ongoing or open-ended action much like the East Ionic -σχε-, and that further nuances depend on semantics and context. A comprehensive study of the thousands of attestations in Hittite remains a desideratum in its own right. For purposes of immediate comparison with East Ionic we may note a tendency to string-occurrence eerily similar to Homeric usage:

nu-za ŠEŠ-as ŠEŠ-an kattan peskit
 [LÚar]as-ma-za LÚaran kattan peskit
 [nu-kan 1]-as 1-an kuwaskit

'brother would betray brother,
 friend would betray friend,
 and one would kill the other'
 (KBo II 5 IV 16–18)

In a similar vein (KUB V 22, 23) 1-as (1)-an appeskit nu halluwiskir 'one would pick on the other, and they would fight', or in a more peaceable mode (KUB XIII 35 I 4) [nu] UNUTUM kuit kuedani peskit n-at ŪL si-yaeskit 'what(ever) tool he gave to someone he did not seal(-stamp)'. Occasionally a passage will emulate the most elaborate of Homeric strings:

IŠTU ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-ma-za-kan kuezza azzikkinun
IŠTU GAL-ya-kan kuezza akkuskinun
sasti-ya-za-kan kuedani seskeskinun
IŠTU ^{URUDU}DU₁₀xA-ya-za-kan kuezza arreskinun

‘from what table I ate,
 and from what cup I drank,
 and in what bed I slept,
 and from what bowl I washed myself’
 (KBo IV 2 IV 28 – 32)

The semantic range stretches from daily habits to the growth of trees, *hēyawēs kuit tasnuskir sallanuskir* ‘whom rains made sturdy and great’ (KUB XXIX 1 I 27). It can also appear as a historical present in describing regular stance or gesture in mythical narrative (KUB XXXIII 120 I 17):

GİR.MEŠ-as-sas GAM-an hinkiskitta
NAG-na-ssi-kan GAL.HI.A-us ŠU-i-ssi zikkizzi

‘to his feet (Kumarbi) bows down,
 drinking cups in his hand he places’

As Kumarbi in Kronos-fashion later broods revenge against his own son the storm-god, his musings are also cloaked in such historical presents (KUB XXXIII 98 I 4 – 8):

nu-za ^DKumarbis GALGA-tar ZI-ni kattan daskizzi
UD.KAM-an kuis ^{LÚ}HUL-an sallanuskizzi
nu-za ^{DU}-ni menahhanda HUL-tar daskizzi
 (dupl. XXXIII 96 I 7 idalawatar san[hiskizzi])
nu ^{DU}-ni menahhanda tarpanallin sallanuskizzi

‘Kumarbi counsel unto his mind takes,
 he who in a day an evil one raises,
 against the storm-god ill action takes (dupl.: plans),
 against the storm-god a surrogate raises’

Here the *-ski-* formation dwells on Kumarbi’s mind-set prior to the start of action, much as inversely in the *Iliad* (1.490) Achilles marked the cessation of his activity by the string *πῶλέσχετο ... φθινύθεσκε ... ποθέεσκε*.

On the other hand, when straight action is going briskly forward, there is no use for this formation in either Hittite or Greek. After putting out Patroklos’ funeral pyre with wine, the Greeks (*Iliad* 23.252 – 4)

ὄστέα λευκά

ἄλλεγον ἐς χρυσέην φιάλην καὶ δίπλακα δημόν,
ἐν κλισίῃσι δὲ θέντες ἑανῶ λιτὶ κάλυψαν

‘gathered white bones into a gold bowl and double fat,
and putting on a couch covered with fine linen’

The corresponding Hittite text, however, is not the record of a funeral but the mortuary ritual for royalty, set down for all time, and therefore uses the *-ski-* formations (*KUB XXX 15 Vs. 3–6*, after describing the extinction of the flame with beer, wine and other liquid):

nu hastai IŠTU lappa KÙ.BABBAR daskanzi
n-at-kan ANA YÀ.DUG.GA hūpar KÙ.BABBAR anda zikkanzi
IŠTU YÀ.DUG.GA-ma-at-kan sarā daskanzi
n-at-kan GAM-ta ANA GAD^{GAD}gazzarnuli zikkanzi

‘the bones with silver tongs they take,
and into good fat in a silver bowl they put them;
but out of the fat they take them up,
and down on a fine cloth they put them’

In the nature of the Hittite corpus the great mass of occurrences are of this type, describing prescribed, habitual, oftentimes ritual action, e. g.

n-an ANA ALAM piran arha iskalliskanzi n-an arha pessieskanzi
‘it (viz. a tunic) before the picture they tear apart and throw it away’ (*KUB XXXIX 15 I 9–10*).

n-an-si-pa namma UZUÚR UZUÚR anda appeskizzi n-an arha ānsiskizzi ‘she then wraps him around limb for limb and wipes him off’ (*KUB XXIV 13 II 15–16*).

n-us hassaz EGIR-pa ispannit 1-EN-as (1)-EN-as daskizzi n-us azzikizzi ‘them from the fireplace with a spit one by one he takes, and eats them’ (*KUB VII 1 H 4–5*).

nu LUGAL-as KUŠE.SIR kuyēs anniskatteni nu KUŠ.GUD ŠA É LÚMUHALDIM dāskatten ‘you who make the king’s shoes, take cowhide from the butchershop!’ (*KUB XIII 3 III 4–5*).

INIM ... kuit GIM-[an] istamaskisi n-at-mu iya[...] *hatreski* ‘when you hear some matter ... write it to me!’ (*KUB XXVI 90 IV 1–3*).

nu uskandu istamaskandu-ya ‘let them see and hear!’ (*KBo IV 10 Vs. 51, Bo 86/299 III 80*).

Unlike Hittite, in Greek the persistence of aspect in the present : aorist system rendered superfluous the **-ske-* formations in the imperative and in nonfinite forms; cf. *sipanzakki* vs. *sipandi* but σπένδε vs. σπείσον, or *sippazakiuwan* vs. *sipanduwan* but σπένδειν vs. σπείσαι. The same opposition in the subjunctive largely took care of present tense usages in all generalizing subordinate clauses (“whoever...”, “as long as...”, etc.). But for the narrative preterite Greek had an unmarked aorist and a partially marked imperfect (which especially in perfective verbs tended to lose its marking, e.g. ἴξε ‘sat down’ [*Iliad* 18.422]), while Hittite had a single unmarked preterite. Hittite used the **-ske-* forms here as elsewhere to mark an ongoing action, and it may have been this feature that East Ionic copied in epic narrative style, as a reinforcement of the weakened imperfect. The Greek usage is always in the imperfect tense, and it does not seem to matter whether the stem is that of the present or the aorist (σπένδεσθε = σπείσασθε, ὤθεσθε = ὠσασθε), since the model simply provided the recipe “verbal stem + **-ske-*”.

If indeed the East Ionic epic *-σθε-* conjugation is of Anatolian inspiration, it may be less due to conscious copying than to a kind of “Sprachbund” effect cutting across contiguous or overlapping linguistic boundaries, such as is seen in the Balkans where Romanian and Bulgarian have both developed a postpositive definite article, or Romanian and Modern Greek both possess a “voluntative” future tense formation using the verb ‘to wish’. In any event it implies contact if not symbiosis between an eastern form of the Late Mycenaean Greek and thirteenth-century Hittite in or around western Anatolia, and especially of some familiarity with Hittite language and literature on the part of an incipient aeolic tradition. Because Luwian lacks the *-ski-* formation (having instead a regular *-sa-* which occasionally occurs in Hittite [*essa-* as iterative of *iya-* ‘do’]) it cannot have served as a source, which further weakens certain claims on Luwian as the “language of the Trojans” and as a potential carrier of epic tradition (cf. e.g. Yoël Arbeitman, *Diachronica* 3: 283–91 [1986]). Luwian was the language of southern Anatolia, from Lycia to Syria, but its presence on the west coast is less plausible than that of Hittite itself, or at least of some kind of northern-type Anatolian (perhaps surviving in Lydian) which on the literate and literary plane had been subject to centuries of levelling by the official language of the capital. In this manner the question of Greek-Hittite contacts acquires a twofold dimension: not just “Greeks in Hittite texts” but Hittite-influenced linguistic conventions in Greek epic dialect.

Part 3

Homeric and Hittite Similes Compared

This part essays to effect a confluence of several strands of past and current scholarship; study of the Homeric simile as a device *sui generis*, appreciation of the impact of "eastern" poetry on Greek epic, and investigation of the kind and genre of similes in the Hittite texts. The first area is well covered by classical scholarship, the second is more sporadic and venturesome, and for the third one is reduced to fairly basic labor in the thickets of Anatolian philology.

Works on Homeric similes in this century range from Hermann Fränkel's pioneering *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* (1921) to George P. Shipp's *Studies in the Language of Homer* (1953, second edition 1972) to Michael Coffey's "The Function of the Homeric Simile" (*AJP* 78: 113–32 [1957]) to Denys J. N. Lee's *The Similes of the Iliad and the Odyssey Compared* (1964) to William C. Scott's *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* (1974), not to overlook such attempts at iconographic bridgebuilding as Roland Hampe's *Die Gleichnisse Homers und die Bildkunst seiner Zeit* (1952) and Wolfgang Schadewaldt's „Die homerische Gleichniswelt und die kretisch-mykenische Kunst“ (*Hermeneia. Festschrift Otto Regenbogen* 9–27 [1952]). A thorough taxonomy has been made, and both function and development have been variously elucidated. Shipp's insistence on the relative linguistic lateness of formal elements in similes, Lee's emphasis on the stark contrast between the spare use of similes in the *Odyssey* and their baroque proliferation in the *Iliad*, and Scott's stress on orality as a key feature of composition all highlight the novel artistic rather than archaic or tradition-bound uses of the Homeric simile.

The art of overwrought nonce elaboration must indeed be given its due. Take as an example the four occurrences of the expression λέων ὀρεσίτροφος. In *Odyssey* 9.292, where the Cyclops bashes the brains of a couple of Odysseus' men and mangles their bodies in an instant cannibal meal, complete with entrails, bone, and marrow, the performance simply rates the brief comparison ἤσθιε δ' ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος 'he ate like a mountain-bred lion'. But before an *Iliadic* αἰδός is through with this expression, we read (12.299-307)

“he set out like a mountain-bred lion who has long been lacking in meat, and its macho spirit bids it to go even to some tight homestead in order to attack the sheep, for even if he finds there herdsmen with hounds and spears guarding the sheep he is not minded to run from the fold without a try, but either bounds and drags away or is himself hit first by a shaft from some swift hand — thus then the spirit moved Sarpedon ...”

Here the simile takes on a life of its own, beyond any balanced comparison, and by the time the miniature tableau is completed the analogy is resumed with a belated jolt which nevertheless gets the comparison back on track. But elsewhere the elaborator does not mind derailing it in midstream, so that the resumption no longer targets the lion but ancillary figures introduced in the course of expansion (*Iliad* 17.61–9):

“As when some mountain-bred lion, confident in might, drags off the best cow of a pasturing herd, and first grabs and breaks her neck with his powerful teeth, and then rending her gulps down the blood and entrails, and around him dogs and herdsmen yell a lot from afar but will not confront him, for yellow fright grips them — so none of them had the guts to confront Menelaos”.

Finally, when the *Odyssey* (6.130–6) tries one of its rare elaborated similes, the whole machinery of the stereotype slips off the track: the lion is still routinely termed “confident in might” but appears rather as a rain-soaked and wind-blown skulker driven by hunger to desperate attack, and all this as an awkward analogue to the naked and scummy shipwrecked Odysseus about to supplicate Nausikaa and her maids. It is safe to say that aoidic art was not above playing fast and loose with the simile, and not always with optimal literary success. The best of its baggage was bequeathed to the literary posterity of Vergil, Dante, Milton, and other inheritors of the classical tradition (cf. e.g. C. M. Bowra, *Tradition and Design in the Iliad* 114–28 [1930]).

But what about antecedents? Clearly the similes in general, and especially the numerous lion-similes, utilized much traditional material, for example the commonplace of the grieving cubless lioness which has its parallel in *Gilgamesh* (cf. T.B.L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* 82 [London 1958]): Achilles mourned Patroklos “moaning loud and long like a well-maned lion whose cubs a deer hunter has dragged away from dense forest” (*Iliad* 18.318–20), while Gilgamesh lamented over Enkidu “like a

lioness reft of cubs". Such similarities, plus the general parallelism of paired characters like Achilles : Patroklos and Gilgamesh : Enkidu have underwritten many a vague assumption of an "eastern" impact on Homer. The *Odyssey* in particular has been fair game, from the suitors' plot and the revenge with a bow, which Emil Forrer (*Mélanges Franz Cumont* 712 [1936]) first compared to the Hittite story of Gurparanzahus, to the very name of the hero, in which Karl Oberhuber (*Festschrift Leonhard C. Franz* 307 – 12 [1965]) preposterously saw a Sumerian *ud.zi*.

Compared to such vague echoings, cultural universals, and diffusional debris (which tend to wash over hellenism in periodic waves of eastern flotsam like those of the Cyrus Gordon – Michael Astour school and lately the work of Walter Burkert or Martin Bernal), a firm grasp on our topic requires a narrower gauge and a straiter gate. We need to compare actual records of adjacent, interacting, perhaps overlapping people, places, and times, in order to determine whether under the surface "noise" of the text there may lurk a coherent thematic structure still discernible in formulaic petrification. Even if the yield should be meager, such is the only rigorous way of comparing Homeric and Hittite similes.

The Iliadic elaborated simile is, as we saw, an innovational extravaganza in its own right, and there is little point in trying to find antecedents or parallels. The simple comparison or embryonic simile, on the other hand, is so basic that thematic matchings are probably random, as when a Hittite king recalls how UR.MAH *mahhan arha tarkuwalliskinun* 'I kept glowering like a lion' (*KBo* X 2 III 1 – 2). Some may be poetic (e.g. *Iliad* 1.359 ἀνέδου πολιτῆς ἀλδὸς ἧύτ' ὁμίχλη [Thetis] rose from the grey sea like a mist'), others hyperbolic (*Iliad* 9.14 δάκρυ χέων ὥς τε κρήνη μελάνυδρος 'shedding tears like a dark-watered spring'; *KUB* VIII 48 I 18 [Gilgamesh] *nu-ssi-kan ishahru parā PA₅.HLA-us mān* [arser 'his tears flowed like irrigation ditches'], and still others are probably akin to current locutions (of the "fit as a fiddle" type), more of concern to the respective lexica than to the study of literary simile.

But there remains a distinct middle ground where precise comparison of Homeric and Hittite similes is possible. This is the well-balanced extended simile, expanded beyond the embryonic but not elaborated out of joint, with both parts in an expressional equilibrium. In Hittite this type is common in utterances of analogic magic where verbatim matching of parallels is essential to the efficacy of the procedure. Famous examples *in malam partem* are the Hittite oaths for soldiers (cf. Norbert Oettinger, *Die militärischen Eide der Hethiter* [1976]) where the recruits are made to touch a variety of substances (yeast, wax, tallow, sinews, salt, malt, barm)

which are then subjected to procedures (fermentation, burning, grinding) intended to impress on the inductees the dire consequences of oath-breaking, typically (*KBo* VI 34 I 31 – 38) “As one takes a bit of this yeast and mixes it in the doughbowl, and lets the bowl stand for a day, and it swells, (even so) let these oaths seize him who breaks them . . . and let him be crushed by illness” (i. e. suffer dropsy, which causes swelling of the abdomen). More often, however, such analogies are invoked in a positive vein, in order to guard against demonic incursion or pollution. This prophylaxis in turn can be couched in either a positive or a negative simile:

halkis-wa mahhan NAM.LÚ.ULÛ.LU GUD *huitarr-a hūman hui-*
nuskizzi LUGAL SAL.LUGAL *kī-ya É-ir kās halkis kallarit*
uddanaz QATAMMA hui-snuddu

‘even as grain sustains mankind, ox, sheep, and all wildlife, may this grain likewise sustain against the demon king, queen, and this house’ (*KBo* IV 2 I 58 – 60)

Conversely:

kās-ma-wa-za ANŠU.GÌ[R.NUN.NA GIM-a]_n ÛL *hāsi ANA*
LUGAL-i-ya-wa-kan [UH₄]-*tar papratar NÍ.TE-si QATAMMA le*
ari

‘even as this mule does not procreate, likewise let sorcery (and) defilement not attain the king’s person’ (*KUB* XLI 21 IV 7 – 9)

Once pollution is a fact, however, cathartic measures are in order, as formulated for example in several great similes drawn from one and the same ritual:

UDU.A.LUM GIM-an UDU.SÍG+*SAL* *ārki* [*nu-za armah*]*hi*
kāss-a-za URU-as parnas UDU.A.LUM [DÛ-*ru nu LÍL-ri* GE₆]-*in*
KI-an argaru nu-za ēšhar [*papratar*] *wastul* GE₆-*is* *KI-as armahdu*

‘even as a ram covers the ewe and she becomes pregnant, so too let this township become a ram and cover on the steppe the dark earth, and may the dark earth be impregnated with (i. e. absorb) the blood, defilement, and sin’ (*KBo* X 45 IV 30 – 33, emended from duplicate *KUB* XLI 8 IV 29 – 32)

karizz-a-kan GIM-an URU-*az sēhur* IM-an *ārri suhha-ma-kan A-az*
ārri n-at-kan GAM G₁S₂PISĀN-*az ārzi kell-a* URU-*as parnas*
HUL-lun EME-an kās aniyawaranza QATAMMA parkunu
at-kan kariz aruni anda pidāu

'even as a deluge washes crud (and) mud off the city, and water washes the roof, and it flows down the drainpipe, may this rite likewise cleanse the evil calumny about this township, and may the deluge carry it to the sea' (KBo X 45 IV 37–41)

suhhaza-kan mahha]n wātar katta [āraszi n-at namma EGIR-pa
 GIŠPISĀN-lī] ŪL paizzi [kell-a parnas HUL-tu papra]tar NEŠ
 DINGIR-LIM ēšhar iṣḥahru wasta[is hurt]āus kurkurimas [pa]rā
 lahūwaru n-a[t namm]a EGIR-pa le uizzi

'even as water flows down from the roof and does not go back again in the drainpipe, may also this house's evil defilement, perjury, bloodshed, tears, despoliation, curse, and mutilation be poured forth, and may it not come back again' (KBo X 45 I 22–27, emended from duplicates KUB VII 41 Vs. 29–31 and KUB XLI 8 I 8–11)

This conjuring of the infernal powers (edited by Heinrich Otten in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 54: 114–57 [1961]) takes place on a riverbank, where the conjurer opens up a sacrificial pit with a dagger and slaughters a sheep into it, along with offerings of fatbread, groats, and mush, together with beer, wine, and other ritual potables. He invokes the sun-goddess of the earth to open the gate and let come up the "ancient deities", including the seer (^LHAL) Aduntarris and the seeress (^SALENSI) Zulkis. They shall partake of the offerings and insure the efficacy of the ritual by disposing of the guilt and defilement on their return to the nether world.

The broad and detailed similarity of this ritual to a sequence in the *Odyssey* has been noted, e.g. by Gerd Steiner (*Ugarit-Forschungen* 3: 265–83 [1971]). Pooling the details of Circe's directions to Hades (10.508–40) and Odysseus' acting upon them at the beginning of the *Nekyia* (11.13–50, 90–137), Odysseus is to reach the end of Ocean and there, at a junction of the infernal rivers, perform a chthonian sacrifice. He digs a pit with his sword, libates with honey-mix, wine, and water, sprinkles barley-groats, slaughters sheep into the pit, and to the accompaniment of prayers to Hades and Persephone watches for the emergence in the necromantic throng of the seer Teiresias. When the latter appears and partakes of the sacrificial blood, he provides not only a prophecy for Odysseus' return to Ithaca but also a recipe for his reconciliation with Poseidon, thus a lustration of the religious guilt that will have cost so many lives and cast a pall over his wanderings.

One more of the great similes of this Hittite ritual deserves to be quoted:

izzan GIM-an IM-anza pittenuzzi n-at-kan aruni parranta pedai
kēll-a parnas ēšhar papratar QATAMMA pittenuddu n-at-kan
aruni parranda pedāu

‘as the wind sweeps chaff and carries it over the sea, let it
likewise sweep the blood-defilement of this house and carry it
over the sea’ (*KUB XLI 8 II 15–19*)

This simile has a close match in the *Odyssey*, not however in the necromantic sequence but in the descriptive context of the onslaught of Poseidon’s monster-wave upon Odysseus’ raft (5.368–70):

ὥς δ’ ἄνεμος ζαῆς ἥϊων θημῶνα τινάξῃ
καρφαλέων, τὰ μὲν ἄρ τε διεσκέδασ’ ἄλλυδις ἄλλῃ,
ὥς τῆς δοῦρατα μακρὰ διεσκέδασ’

‘as a gale wind scatters a heap of dry chaff and spreads it all
over, thus it shattered the long timbers of the raft’

Here the Hittite simile, occurring in a land-locked environment, curiously speaks of a maritime locale, whereas the Homeric depiction of a violent shipwreck conversely uses rural descriptive matter. Both appear to be formulaic petrifacts of traditional application rather than instant whimsy, with a common denomination that mitigates their seeming inappropriateness. In the Hittite instance it reflects ritual archaism, harking back to folk memory of an erstwhile habitat on a litoral. In Homeric usage it probably means that the epic not only utilizes Anatolian cathartic ritual as the model of the *Nekyia* but has also “secularized” magical formulas for narrative effect. In short, one is justified in this narrow sense to look for ritual origins of the Homeric simile, without necessarily subscribing to such sweeping and controversial theories as those of Charles Autran (*Homère et les origines sacerdotales de l’épopée grecque* [1938]), whose other works (e.g. *Phoinikies et Dravidiens* [1937]) inspired little confidence. The *Odyssey* has only one other wind-simile, and that in the same book (5.328–30), clearly a mitigated poetic variation on the same theme:

ὥς δ’ ὅτ’ ὀπωρινὸς Βορέης φορέῃσιν ἀκάνθας
ἄμ’ πεδίον, πυκιναὶ δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλῃσιν ἔχονται,
ὥς τὴν ἄμ πέλαγος ἄνεμοι φέρον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα

‘even as in late summer a northerly carries thistles along the

field, and they thickly stick together, thus the wind carried the raft over the sea hither and thither'

The *Iliad* has expectably multiplied and elaborated wind-similes by the same formulas, devoid of maritime associations, e. g.

ὥς δ' ἄνεμος ἄχνας φορέει ἱερὰς κατ' ἁλῶας
ἀνδρῶν λιχμώντων, ὅτε τε Ξανθή Δημήτηρ
κρίνη ἐπειγομένων ἀνέμων καρπὸν τε καὶ ἄχνας,
αἱ δ' ὑπολευκαίνονται ἄχυρμαί ...

'even as the wind carries chaff along hallowed threshing-fields when men are winnowing, when fair-haired Demeter with gusts of wind separates grain and chaff, and the chaff-heaps turn whitish (, even so did the Achaeans grow white beneath the dust which the feet of horses struck up)' (5. 499 – 502)

ὥς δ' ὅτ' ὀπωρινὸς Βορέης νεοαρδέ' ἁλῶην
αἰψ' ἀγξεράνη · χαίρει δέ μιν ὅς τις ἐθείρη ·
ὥς ἐξεράνθη πεδῖον πᾶν, καὶ δ' ἄρα νεκροὺς
κῆεν

'even as in late summer a northerly quickly dries a just-soaked threshing-field, and gladdens its harvester, even so all the plain was dried up, and he (viz. Hephaistos) burned the corpses' (21. 346 – 9)

While a case can thus be made for the ritual origin of the Homeric literary wind-and-chaff simile, the same cathartic ritual we have been quoting has one further passage of direct comparative relevance to the Greek epic:

*n-as-kan parā paizzi KÁ-as piran GI-an URUa[essit] arha karaszi
nu kissan memai kūn-wa [GI-an GIM-an] karsun n-as ŪL anda
tamektari kā[ss-a parnas] [i]dālu ēshar QATAMMA karasdu n-at
EGIR-pa le [uizzi]*

'he goes forth and before the gate cuts off a stick with an axe and speaks thus: "even as I cut this stick and it does not reattach itself, may this house likewise cut evil bloodshed and may it not come back!"' (*KUB VII 41 Vs. 24 – 27*, emended from duplicates *KBo X 45 I 16 – 20* and *KUB XLI 8 I 3 – 6*).

This *coniuratio* recalls the *iuramentum* (ὄρκος) which Achilles swears in *Iliad* 1. 234 – 7, 240 – 2:

ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον, τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτε φύλλα καὶ ὄζους
 φύσει, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα τομὴν ἐν ὄρεσσι λέλοιπεν,
 οὐδ' ἀναθελήσει· περὶ γάρ ῥά ἐ χαλκὸς ἔλεψε
 φύλλα τε καὶ φλοιὸν ...
 ἦ ποτ' Ἀχιλλῆος ποθὴ ἵξεται υἷας Ἀχαιῶν
 σύμπαντας· τότε δ' οὐ τι δυνήσεται ἀχνύμενός περ
 χραϊσμεῖν

'by this wand which will never sprout leaves and branches once
 it has left the cutting-place in the mountains, nor shall it bloom
 — for the bronze has stripped it of leaves and bark —, verily
 one day a yearning for Achilles will come upon all the sons of
 the Achaeans, and then you (Agamemnon), though frantic, will
 be of no help'

The Hittite conjurer is doing magic analogy, matching an irrevocably cut stick with the irreversible banishment of evil, with imperative or prohibitive verbal forms in the apodosis, whereas Achilles has shifted into the predictive mode and the future tense, with *ναὶ μὰ* ... *ἦ* instead of *ὥς* ... *ὥς*. The staff is really a prop for his swearing, but the expansion of the simile is not gratuitous, for what he is trying to convey is that "sooner will this stick sprout foliage than I shall make up with Agamemnon", a statement of the "hell will freeze over first" variety, same as the Pope told Tannhäuser in medieval legend.

As this example shows, not all Homeric similes of possible Anatolian inspiration need be balanced poetic props of the *ὥς* ... *ὥς* variety but can be part of the utterances of the actors. When the Lycian Sarpedon expresses to Hektor his fear (*Iliad* 5.487–8)

μή πως ὥς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἁλόντε πανάγρου
 ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε

'lest somehow like snagged with a catch-all net you become
 booty and prey to foemen',

he is echoing in reverse the boast of a Hittite king how

āpūn-ma-kan ^DISTAR ^{URU}Samuha GAŠAN-YA KU₆-un GIM-an
 \\ *hūpalaza EGIR-pa istapta n-an ishiyat*

'my patroness Ishtar of Samuha caught him like a fish with a net
 and bound him' (*KBo* VI 29 II 33–35)

But the great Anatolian rituals remain the most tantalizing sources of

possible inspiration for the image-makers of aeolic epic in Asia Minor. Thus in the famous royal foundation text first edited by Benjamin Schwartz (*Orientalia* N.S. 16: 23–55 [1947]) and subsequently by Maria Francesca Carini (*Athenaeum* 60: 483–520 [1982]), and Massimiliano Marazzi (*Vicino Oriente* 5: 117–69 [1982]), there is an early scene in the mountains, with trees ‘which rains made sturdy and tall’ (*KUB XXIX 1 I* 27: *hēyawēs kuit tasnuskir sallanuskir*), potential raw material for the simile in *Iliad* 12.132–4:

ἕστασαν ὥς ὅτε τε δρύες οὖρεσιν ὑψικάρῃνοι,
αἳ τ’ ἄνεμον μίμνουσι καὶ ὕετον ἤματα πάντα,
ῥίζησιν μεγάλῃσι διηνεκέεσσ’ ἀραρυῖαι

‘they stood like high-topped oaks in the mountains,
who withstand wind and rain every day,
held firm by their big stretching roots’

The trees are then addressed (*ibid.* 28–31):

nepisas kattan uliliskiddumat UR.MAH-as
kattan seskit UG.TUR-as-(s)mas kattan seskit
hartaggas-(s)mas-ma sarā arkiskitta
^{DU} *addas-mis parā idālu zikkīt*

‘under the heavens you thrive, the lion
would pair, the panther would pair by you,
but the bear would couple up against you;
the storm-god my father kept evil from you’

This description of the rapture of nature and the mating of beasts under the storm-god’s tutelage in the mountainous woodlands has a close parallel in the great hierophany of the πότνια θηρῶν on Mount Ida (*Hymn to Aphrodite* 70–4), where ‘grey wolves and fierce lions, bears and leopards’ (πολιοί τε λύκοι χαροποί τε λέοντες ἄρκτοι παρδάλιές τε) mated in pairs under shady bowers (σύνδυο κοιμήσαντο κατὰ σκιόεντας ἐναύλους) in the context of the epiphany of the goddess. As this Aphrodite-Cybele of the Troad is the Greek interpretation of the consort of the Anatolian storm-god, there is a direct link between the divine patrons and the respective tableaux.

The mass of Hittite rituals awaits the attention of editors and interpreters. This quick scratching of a few random surfaces raises suspicions that much more remains to be discovered. Homer is too important to be left to single-track hellenists.

Hethitisch und Indogermanisch. Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens. Hrsg. von E. Neu und W. Meid. 1979. 311 S. öS 1.040, —. [Bd. 25]

Erich Neu, Studien zum endungslosen „Lokativ“ des Hethitischen. 1980. 56 S. öS 200, —. [V 23]

Heinrich Otten, Die 1986 in Boğazköy gefundene Bronzetafel. Zwei Vorträge. 1989. 35 S., 12 Abb. öS 160, —. [V 42]

Jaan Puhvel, ANALECTA INDOEUROPAEA. Delectus Operum Minorum Plerumque Anglice Aliquando Francogallice Editorum Annos 1952—1977 Complectens. 1981. 419 S., Portrait. öS 1.120, —. [Bd. 35]

Jaan Puhvel, Homer and Hittite. 1990. 29 S. öS 120, —. [V 47]

Johann Tischler, Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar. Mit Beiträgen von G. Neumann und (ab Teil II) E. Neu. Fortsetzungswerk in voraussichtlich 10 Lieferungen = 3 Teilbänden. 1977ff. Erschienen sind bisher Lief. 1—4 (= Teil I): A—K. 1983. XXXVIII, 702 S. (mit Einbanddecke) öS 1.440, —; Lief. 5—6: L—M. 1990. VI, 244 S. öS 720, —. In Vorber.: Lief. 7—8: T. (Lief. 5—8 bilden Teil II). [Bd. 20]

Johann Tischler, Das hethitische Gebet der Gassulijawija. Text. Übersetzung, Kommentar. 1981. VI, 85 S. öS 220, —. [Bd. 37]

Johann Tischler, Hethitisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis. Mit einem semasiologischen Index. 1982. 153 S. öS 360, —. [Bd. 39]

Bitte richten Sie Ihre Bestellung an:

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

A-6020 Innsbruck
Elisabethstraße 11